



**0.23%** PLAGIARISM  
APPROXIMATELY

**1.54%** IN QUOTES **Q**  
**0.81%** IN REFERENCES **R**

## Report #9756352

Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Padjadjaran Bandung, Indonesia INTERNATIONAL  
SIYMPOSIUM Relation-Based Psychological . Resources for Developmental  
Potential: Indonesian Examples and General Theoretical Approaches Friday,  
August 4, 2006 Grand Preanger · Bandung SAMBUTAN REKTOR UNIVERSITA  
S PADJADJARAN ASSALAMU & #39; ALAIKUM WR WB. IT IS A GREETINGS.  
PLEASURE TO HAVE US CONGREGATED HERE TODAY, TO EXERCISE  
INTELLECTUAL CONVERSATION. I BELIEVE THAT EXCHANGES IN THOUGHTS  
AND IDEAS, ESPECIALLY ON THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL, WILL LEAD US TO  
EXPLORE FURTHER TO MAKE GOOD THINGS HAPPEN FOR COMMUNITIES WE  
SERVE . THEREFORE, I TRULY APPRECIATE THE ATTENDANCE OF THE  
SPEAKERS AND THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE SYMPOSIUM. DEAR COLLEAGUES,  
TODAY& #39; S SYMPOSIUM IS ONE STEPPING STONE IN AN ON GOING  
PROCESS OF COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE RADBOUD UNIVERSITY OF  
NIJMEGEN AND THE PADJADJARAN UNIVERSITY. AS SOME OF YOU SHOULD  
HAVE KNOWN, PROF. DR. FRANZ MONKS OF RADBOUD UNIVERSITY OF  
NIJMEGEN - ONE OF TODAY& #39; S KEY SPEAKERS- IS THE PIONEER OF THIS  
COLLABORATION . HIS WISDOM AND EXPERTISE IN THE FIELD OF  
PSYCHOLOGY HAVE BEEN AMONG IMPORTANT RESOURCES TO THE GROWTH



OF THE FACULTY OF PSYCHOLOGY OF THE PADJADJARAN UNIVERSITY.  
THEREFORE, IT IS A NECESSITY FOR THE PADJADJARAN UNIVERSITY TO  
HONOR DR. MONKS. TOMORROW, A CEREMONY TO GRANT A DOCTOR  
HONORIS CA USA AWARD IN PSYCHOLOGY, TO THE RESPECTIVE ACADEMIC,  
WILL BE HELD. I AM HOPING THAT TODAY'S AND TOMORROW'S  
CRUCIAL EVENTS WILL STRENGTHEN, EVEN EXPAND, THE COLLABORATIVE  
BONDS BETWEEN THE TWO UNIVERSITIES. FOR I HAVE SEEN AS WELL AS  
FORESEEN THAT SO MUCH BENEFITS ARE TO BE ACQUIRED THROUGH  
COLLABORATIONS BETWEEN UNIVERSITIES. I CAN POINT OUT SOME BENEFITS  
SUCH AS SCIENTIFIC ENRICHMENT, STAFF DEVELOPMENT, ACADEMIC  
EXCHANGES, AND MANY OTHER POSSIBILITIES, NOT TO MENTION THE  
ADVANTAGES WE CAN CULTIVATE TO SERVE OUR COUNTRIES. THEREFORE, I  
STRONGLY ENCOURAGE EVERY ATTEMPT, IN THE PADJADJARAN UNIVERSITY,  
TO ESTABLISH COLLABORATIONS WITH UNIVERSITIES, WITHIN THE COUNTRY  
AS WELL AS ABROAD. LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I WOULD LIKE TO  
SHOW MY GRATITUDE TO ALL THE SPEAKERS WHO HAVE GONE THROUGH  
LONG JOURNEYS TO BE HERE AMONG US. ALSO TO THE HONORARY GUESTS  
AND PARTICIPANTS, I THANK YOU FOR TAKING PART IN THIS INTERNATIONAL



AL SYMPOSIUM. I WISH YOU ALL HAVE A WONDERFUL SYMPOSIUM WASS  
ALAMU &#39;ALAIKUM WR WB. -----Proceeding----- Fakultas  
Psikologi Umversit.as Padjadjaran Bandung, Indonesia INTERNATIONAL  
SIYMPOSIUM Relation-Based Psychological Resources for Developmental  
Potential: Indonesian Examples and General Theoretical Approaches Friday,  
August 4, 2006 Grand Preanger - Bandung SAMBUTAN DEKAN FAKULTAS  
PSIKOLOGI HONORABLE DEWAN PENYANTUN RECTOR OF THE PADJADJARAN  
UNIVERSITY SECRETARY OF THE SENATE OF THE PADJADJARAN UNIVERSITY  
PROFESSORS DEANS OF FACULTIES OF THE PADJADJARAN UNIVERSITY LADIES  
AND GENTLEMEN ASSALAMU &#39;ALAIKUM WR WB. FIRST OF ALL, ALLOW  
ME TO EXPRESS MY GRATITUDE TO ALLAH SWT FOR HIS BLESSSES, SO THAT  
WE CAN GATHER HERE TO SHARE WHAT WE KNOW A LITTLE ABOUT ONE OF  
HIS GREAT CREATIONS , I.E. HUMANS. AS WE ARE AWARE OF, THE MAIN  
TOPIC OF TODAY&#39;S SYMPOSIUM WILL TAKE US TO A DIALOGUE  
CONCERNING HOW RELATIONSHIPS PLAY AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN PROVIDING  
RESOURCES FOR HUMAN POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . HOWEVER, THIS EVENT  
WOULD NOT HAVE SEEMED POSSIBLE, WERE THE SPEAKERS NOT KINDLY  
ENOUGH TO JOIN US TODAY TO FACILITATE THIS SYMPOSIUM. FOR THAT ,



ON BEHALF OF THE FACULTY OF PSYCHOLOGY, PADJADJARAN UNIVERSITY, I WOULD LIKE TO GREATLY THANK ALL THE SPEAKERS. MY GRATITUDE ALSO GOES TO THE AUDIENCE. I SURE HOPE YOU ENJOY THE FORTHCOMING DISCOURSES. DEAR COLLEAGUES, ONE OF THE PURPOSES OF THE SYMPOSIUM WE ARE ABOUT TO TAKE PART IN, IS TO HONOR PROF. DR. FRANZ MONKS OF RADBOD UNIVERSITY OF NIJMEGEN, TO WHOM THE PADJADJARAN UNIVERSITY IS GOING TO GRANT A DOCTOR HONOR, IS CAUSA IN PSYCHOLOGY. DR. MONKS IS QUITE KNOWN IN HIS FIELD, AND HAS BEEN PROVIDING SIGNIFICANT ACADEMIC SUPPORTS TO MORE THAN A FEW STAFFS OF THE FACULTY OF PSYCHOLOGY, PADJADJARAN UNIVERSITY. CONSEQUENTLY, IT IS LEGITIMATE TO STATE THAT TO A GREAT EXTENT DR. MONKS CONTRIBUTES TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FACULTY OF PSYCHOLOGY. I AM SURE THAT WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED AND GAINED FROM THIS RESPECTABLE SCHOLAR WILL HALLMARK OUR ATTEMPTS TO MAINTAIN THE COLLABORATION BETWEEN PADJADJARAN UNIVERSITY AND RADOUD UNIVERSITY OF NIJMEGEN. BEFORE WE ARRIVE AT THE END OF WHAT I WAS GOING TO SAY, I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO INFORM THAT THIS SYMPOSIUM IS ALSO A SECTION OF THE ACTIVITY SEQUENCES OF



THE 5TH LUSTRUM COMMEMORATION OF THE FACULTY OF PSYCHOLOGY,  
PADJADJARAN UNIVERSITY. THEREFORE, I REALLY APPRECIATE YOUR ATT  
ENDANCE. I HOPE THAT THE OLDER THE FACULTY GETS, THE MORE IT CO  
NTRIBUTES TO INDONESIA, AND THE REST OF THE WORLD. LAST BUT  
NOT LEAST, I WOULD LIKE TO SINCERELY THANK THE COMMITTEE ME  
MBERS OF THE SYMPOSIUM. OUR CONVENIENCE DOES SHOW THEIR  
HARD WORK. HONORABLE PARTICIPANTS, MAY ALLAH SWT ALLOW US TO  
KEEP LEARNING, TO BE ABLE TO UNDERSTAND HIS AUTHORITY AS WELL  
AS HIS GRACEFULNESS. WASSALAMU &#39;ALAIKUM WRWB. II

-----Proceeding----- Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Padjadjaran  
Bandung, Indonesia INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM Relation-Based Psychological  
Resources for Developmental Potential: Indonesian Examples and General  
Theoretical Approaches Friday, August 4, 2006 Grand Preanger - Bandung  
AGENDA TIME & PROGRAM | SPEAKERS | 07.00-08.30 Registration &  
re-registration (Front desk) 08.30-08.50 Opening ceremony Rector of  
Universitas Padjadjaran Dean of the Faculty of Psychology Universitas Padjadjaran  
SYMPOSIUM TOPIC 1 : PROCREATION Value of Children in Urban & Rural West  
Prof Dr. Kusdwiratri Setiono, S. Psi Java (UNPAD, Bandung) dan Dr. Lieke J.



Wisnubrata (UNPAD. Bandung) 08.50-10.20 Adolescents in Love: the practice of  
Alphonsus Rachmad Djati Winamo, Pacaran M.Sc (UNIKA, Semarang) Giving  
Birth in Central Java: Fortune or Dra. Margaretha Sib Setija Utami, M.  
Misfortune? Kes (UNIKA, Semarang) 10.20-10.30 BREAK SYMPOSIUM TOPIC 2  
: ON TRUST Children's Trust in Their Parents: Drs. Peter Nelwan, MA  
(UNPAD, 10.30-11.30 Measures and correlates Bandung) Trust in the  
Supervisor -Worker Kristiana Haryanti, M. Psi (UNIKA, Relationship  
Semarang) 11.30-13.00 LUNCH BREAK & FRIDAY PRAYING SYMPOSIUM  
TOPIC 3: GIFTEDNESS Personality Characteristics of Gifted Dr. Endang  
Widyorini Haryono 13.00-14.00 Adolescents (UNIKA, Semarang) Deter-  
minants of Academic Achievement in Dr. Wisjnu Martani (Gadjah Mada Gifted  
Adolescents University, Yogyakarta) 14.00-14.10 PREPARATION SYM-  
POSIUM TOPIC 4: ON THEORIES What does human potential entail, where  
does it reside Dr. Ad Srnitsman (Behavioural Science and how does it get  
actualised? Developing action Institute, Radboud University, skills as example  
of the development of human Nijmegen; the Netherlands) potential 14.10-1  
6.00 Narrative Resources for Developmental Prof. Dr. Peter Heymans (Utr-  
echt potential University, Utrecht; the Netherlands) (Re)constructing



conditi ons for th e Prof. dr. Paul Roeders , (Educa tion develop ment and use of human potentia ls. Dev elop ment , WYG Intern atio nal , U.K.) 1 6. 00- 16 .15  
COFFEE BRE AK AND PRAYING 1 6.1 5-17. 00 DISCUSSIO N Introduction to the  
discussion by Prof . dr . Franz Monks (Ra dbud Unive rsity, Nij megen, the N  
etherlands) 1 7 .00- 17 .05 CLOS ING CERE MONY Fakultas Psikologi Universitas  
Padjadjaran Bandung, Indonesia INTERNATIONAL SIYMPOSIUM Relation-Based  
Psychological Resources for Developmental Potential:Indonesian Examples and  
General Theoretical Approathes Friday, August 4, 2006 Grand Preanger -  
Bandung SUSUNAN PANITIA Penanggung Jawab Umum Penasihat Fasilitator  
Penanggung Jawab Ketua Wakil Ketua I Wakil Ketua II Sekretaris I Sekretaris II  
Bendahara Akomodasi & Transportasi Persidangan & Protokoler Humas & Pubdok  
Rektor Universitas Padjadjaran Para Pembantu Rektor di Lingkungan Universitas  
Padjadjaran Para Kepala Biro di Lingkungan Universitas Padjadjaran Dekan  
Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Padjadjaran R. Urip Purwono Ramdan Panigoro  
Peter Nelwan Parikesit Retno Hanggarini Ninin Aulia Iskandarsyah Keri Lestari  
Dandan Eka Purbaningsih 1. R. Herwin Garibaldi 2. Catur Retno Wulandari 3.  
Sansan Erma war 4. Jim Sukarja 1. Wina Erwina 2. Tuti I. Sodjakusumah 3. Afra  
Hafni Noer 4. Frederick Dermawan Purba 1. Dadan Triawan 2. Hj. Theresiah



Lominardi Lubis 3. Dien Fakhri Iqbal Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Padjadjaran Bandung, Indonesia INTERNATIONAL SIYMPOSIUM Relation-Based Psychological Resources for Developmental Potential: Indonesian Examples and General Theoretical Approaches Friday, August 4, 2006 Grand Preanger - Bandung 6. Trust in the Supervisor-Worker Relationship Kristiana Haryanti UNIKA, Semarang Most people go not realize the importance of trust in the work environment. Being trusted by others has influence on job performance. Trust plays an important role for employees to get opportunity to be promoted. New employees as newcomers to the organization are in the critical period to be trusted or being trusted by their supervisor. The newcomer's career depends on the smoothness of this process. Furthermore, some authors propose that trust will influence the relationship between supervisors and their subordinate (so called 'Leader Member eXchange' or LMX), organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB), performance appraisal, job satisfaction, and "liking". Most empirical studies on these topics are done in the U.S.A., and increasingly in East-Asia. For Indonesian companies no such studies are known. Therefore, this study will compare whether in Indonesia the relations between trust and other constructs (LMX, OCB, etc) is similar to those





documented for western countries. This study will particularly focus on socialization after-entry of new comers. A longitudinal field study was conducted taking data from 255 newcomers/workers and their supervisors as subjects from four types of organization (education, manufacturing, distribution and finance). Follow-ups were done twice: at approximately 3 and 6 months after entry. Efforts were done to assess the construct validity of the measurements. Linear regression analyses were done to describe the relationship of trust with other constructs. - 8 Fakultas Psikologi Uni versitas Padjadjaran Bandung, Indonesia INTERNATIONAL SIYMPOSIUM Relation-Based Psychological Resources for Developmental Potential:Indonesian Examples and General Theoretical Approaches Friday, August 4, 2006 Grand Preanger - Bandung Curriculum Vitae Address (private) E-mail : Kristiana Haryanti : Semarang, 15 December 1967 : Psychology, Catholic University Soegijapranata : Organizational Psychology : Jl. Pawiyatan Luhur IV/1, Bendan Dhuwur, Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia : Jl. Singosari VII/10 Semarang, Central Java Indonesia : Kristianaharyanti@yahoo.com : (024) 8413570 Mobile Phone: 08122878342 I (024) 70708871 Phone Name Date of birth Faculty Department Address (office) Education background: No Level of University Faculty Graduated Topic Interest Education 1. University



Psychology Faculty Psychology 1992 Organization Catholic university Psychology  
Soegijapranata, Semarang, Central Java 2. Master Gadjahmada Psychology 1999  
Organization Degree University, Psychology Yogyakarta, Central Java 3.  
Doctoral Radboud University, Psychology candidate Organization Degree  
Nijmegen, The Psychology Netherland Training No Topic University Period  
Year 1. Health Promotion Gent University, 4 month 1995 Belgium Lecturing  
in: 1. Human Resource Management/Personnel Psychology (1995-2002) 2.  
Consumer Psychology (1995 -2002) 3. Organizational Psychology (1993-20  
02) 4. Experimental Psychology (1999-2002) 5. Inventory Test: EPPS, Kuder,  
SSCT (1999 -2002) Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Padjadjaran Bandung ,  
Indonesia INTERNATIONAL SIYMPOSIUM Relation-Based Psychological Resources  
for Developmental Potential: Indonesian Examples and General Theoretical  
Approaches Friday, August 4, 2006 Grand Preanger - Bandung Research: No Title  
Year 1. Correlation between health and safety worker perception and 1992 their  
satisfaction No Title Year 2. The health behavior in school aged children in  
Semarang and 1994 Batanz: pilot study 3. Sources of stress in non profit  
organization and their effects on 1995 individual and organizational health 4.  
The health behavior in school aged children in Semarang 1995 5. Group



dynamic evaluation on adolescent in Semarang 1997 6. Motivation in servant&#39;s palace of "Keraton Yogyakarta" : a 1998 qualitative method 7. Correlation between perception of service quality and 1999 consumers&#39; values with consumers&#39; satisfaction 8. Situational analysis and human resources developmental 2000 planning of Dr Karyadi public hospital, Semarang 10 . Women seller life style on traditional market 2002 Articles: No Title Publication 1 . Education problems in Indonesia and their relationship PRANATA, VIII, No.6, with human resource quality April-June 1998, Unika Soegijapranata : Semarang 2. Health behavior in Adolescent : pilot study in Indonesian Semarang and Batang Epidemiological Journal, Vol . 2, No . 1, 1st edition, 1998 3. The health behavior in school aged children, study in Health promotion Semarang : methodological problems in cross cultural international journal, research Vo.14, No. 1. 1999. Oxford University Press: Great Britain 4. De termi nan ts of smo king behavior am ong adolescen ts Tobacco Control : An in Semarang , Indonesia International Journal, V ol. 8; 186 -191 , 1999. B riti sh Medical A ssociation: Michigan 5. Educati on bas e on freedom , peace and fair with PRANATA, X, N0 .3 , "am ong" method April -June 2000. U nika Soe gijaprana ta: Semaran g 6. Correlat ion between perception of service qualiti y and PSIKODIM ENSIA, I, consum ers&#39; values with consumers&#39; satisf a ction No. I 20 00, Unika Soe gij apranata: Se marang 7 . Smoki ng behavior on Adolescence : A Focu s Gr oup PSIKODIM ENSIA, 2002 Discussion TRUST IN SUPERVISOR-WORKER RELATIONSHIP Kristiana Haryanti Catholic University Soegijapranata Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia Abstract Most people do not



realize the importance of trust in the work environment. Being trusted by others has influence on job performance. Trust plays an important role for employees to get opportunity to be promoted. New employees as newcomers to the organization are in the critical period to be trusted or being trusted by their supervisor. The newcomer's career depends on the smoothness of this process. Furthermore, some authors propose that trust will influence the relationship between supervisors and their subordinate (so called 'Leader Member eXchange' or LMX), organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB), performance appraisal, job satisfaction, and "liking". Most empirical studies on these topics are done in the U.S.A., and increasingly in East-Asia. For Indonesian companies no such studies are known. Therefore, this study will compare whether in Indonesia the relations between trust and other constructs (LMX, OCB, etc) is similar to those documented for western countries. This study will particularly focus on socialization after-entry of new comers. A longitudinal field study was conducted taking data from 255 newcomers/workers and their supervisors as subjects from four types of organization ( education, manufacturing, distribution and finance). Follow-ups were done twice: at approximately 3 and 6 months after entry. Efforts were done to assess the construct validity of the measurements. Linear regression analyses were done to describe the relationship of trust with other constructs. The result shows that Trust construct (Condition of Trust Inventory/CTI) from the West appears to be different from that of Central Java workers and supervisors. The Indonesian CTI can best be scored on two dimensions : general trust and general distrust. G



eneral trust measure shows the expected positive co rr elations with measure of oth er constructs (such as LMX , OCB , Li king, Jo b Perf ormance and Job Sati sf acti on). W ith re gar d to mutuali ty (Leader -Member), Leader-trust did not predict Member -trust ; also, there was on av era ge not much discrepancy betw een Leader -trust and Member -trust. Intr oduction B azz erman and Donaldson proposed that trust is essential for eff ective mana gement, effective government and effective social system (Dunn and Schwei tzer, 200 5). Furthe rmore , Gurt man; Schin dler & Thomas (O modei, MM; McLe nnan, J.2 000) identi fied that trust is an impo rtant aspec t of pro -soci al hum an behavior and experience at 1 individual and organizational. Butler ( 1991) also stated that trust is essential to the development of management careers. New employees as new comers are in a critical period to be trusted or being trusted by their supervisors because their acts in the workplace and may affect their future careers . If their acts are positive, such as doing work well or indicate good relationship with others, their supervisors will respect and trust them . Whitener et al (Brower at al, 2000) found that subordinates who are trusted by their supervisor could have advantages: sharing more sensitive information, delegation, empowerment, awarding a promotion, less monitoring or surveillance. On the other hand, supervisors who are trusted by their subordinates could also have advantages such as loyalty and subordinates "will perform their work well. So, trust is important in maintaining interpersonal relationship and essential to the development of managerial careers (Butler, 1991). This study is part of research which constitutes of LMX-Java research



project. LMX stands for Leader Member Exchange as stated by researchers such as Graen, Novak & Sommercamp (1982); Graen, Liden & Hoel (1982) . LMX-Java is a research studying the relationship between new employees and their supervisors, how their peers assess members' job performance and tactics used by new employees when they have developed relationship with their supervisors. The research will study not only to find out how relationship occurred between new employees and their leaders but also how new employees feel about organization culture and organizational justice. Moreover, the outcomes of new employees' work were also investigated such as their performance appraisals and job satisfactions. LMX is influenced by organizational culture. LMX is also influenced by the behavior of workers such as Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Liking, Job Performance, Job Satisfaction and Trust between supervisors and their workers . The location of the research is Central Java which is a province of Java island in Indonesia . In LMX-Java project, new employees in their socialization entry in 3 to 9 months will be involved because new employees important source for running organizations and can become an important asset for organizations. New employees as new members of organization should consider their adjustments in socialization entry because the success of hiring a new employee depends on her/his socialization in the first job year. Successful new employees in their socialization entry could affect organization productivity in the future . Early stage of becoming a new employee is important to be a good employee later in order to achieve successful goals of organization. As the research was too



broaden, this report will only focus on trust as a part of LMX-Java research project. The reasons are because trust plays an important role in the relationship between supervisors and subordinates and both parties could have advantages which can be developed to obtain success in achieving good working performance. Study of trust in organization has grown in the last decade and evidences of the importance of trust have been arising. Borowicz (2002) stated that trust is the key factor in successful work environment, an employee's trust in the supervisor and supervisor's trust in worker, enabling both parties to fulfill their responsibilities and act predictably. Trust and its antecedents and consequences are likely to be especially important in the context of supervisor's and their worker's relationship in the first beginning of their cooperation because their careers depend on the smoothness of this trust-building process . Most of trust studies have been conducted in western countries; meanwhile the impact of trust is important to be understood by many people in other countries such as Indonesia . So, the purposes of this study are a) to adapt Condition of Trust Inventory (CTI) to be used for research in Indonesia, b) to examine the theoretical trust construct from western country is same with trust construct in Indonesian subjects, c) to do empirical tests of theoretically expected relation between trust measure and measures of other constructs. Trust Concept in the West Trust has been studied across several disciplines, including economics (Williamson, 1993), sociology (Gambetta, 1988) and psychology (Rotter, 1971). Theoretical basis of trust is based on social exchange theory. This theory is grounded in an economic model of human



behavior whereby interactional process between individuals are motivated by a desire to maximize rewards and minimize losses (e.g. Thibout & Kelley, 1959). The basic premise of social exchange theory is that 3 relationships providing more rewards than cost will yield enduring mutual trust and attractions (Blau, 1961). Across many disciplines, different definitions of trust have been developed. They were some definitions of trust in literatures but most theories agree that trust is fundamentally a psychological state (Kramer, 1999). Mayer (1995) stated that risk appear central in many definition of trust and consist of the perceived probability of loss as perceived by the trusting person(s). Furthermore, Luhmann (1979) argue that risk is a prerequisite in the choice of trust. Therefore, if actions could be undertaken with complete certainty, trust would not be needed (Lewis & Weigert, 1985) (Quote in Butler & Cantrell). In general, trust can exist between individual, groups, and institutions. This research focuses on dyadic-level of trust between Supervisor and eir Subordinate. In dyadic relationship, would have two constructs: Leader trust in subordinate (LTS) and subordinate trust in leader (STL). So, the appropriate definition for my research is definition stated by Butler (1991), that trust can be defined as the willingness to risk increasing one's vulnerability to another person whose behavior is beyond one's control. If one controls the other's behavior, then trust is irrelevant or at least unnecessary. Mayer et al (1995) propose the model of trust which focuses on the interpersonal relationships between two parties, e trust or and the trustee. It can be applied to any dyad and thus useful in describing leader-subordinate relationship. Zand. 1972





(Brower, et al, 2000) described the development of trust as a spiral reinforcement process. Buttler (1991) also described that the developmental of trust also cyclical, mutually reinforcing process. In social exchange process, the behavior of each player influences the other in an iterative fashion (Kramer, 1998). So, there is reciprocity in trust. There are three trust building processes in organization (Liden, Sparrowe & Wayne, 1997): a. role taking, involves one or more episodes whereby the leader communicates a sent role to the member such as making request or assigning a task. Although noise may affect transmission of the role, the member receives it and reacts. The member's reaction provides feedback to the leader who evaluates the member's behavior and decides whether to initiate another episode. In this phase, the leader tests and assesses the member's motivations and potential. b. role making, in this phase, the nature of the leader-member relationship becomes defined. Although either party may initiate this phase, it typically involves the leader providing an opportunity for the member to attempt an unstructured task. This opportunity implies a certain working relationship with the leader. If the opportunity is accepted by the member, the leader member relationship develops overtime into a high-quality exchange, meaning that the leader and member must contribute resources valued by the other party and both parties must view the exchange as fair. c. role routinization, Graen and Scandura (1987) described this phase as the point where the behaviors of the leader and member became interlocked. Further, the leader and member develop an understanding and clear mutual expectation, resulting from collaborating and unstructured



tasks. This is the final stage of the model and the implication is that the quality of exchange between leader and member typically remain stable from this point on. In this phase, the LMX-relationship has become stable. This study uses trust measure proposed by Butler (1991), the Condition of Trust Inventory (CTI). He developed the CTI by identified of condition of trust and items by interviewing 84 managers employed by diverse firms. After interviewing, selection and validation of items were done by Jackson's principles and 380 students enrolled in graduate and undergraduate management courses at a southeastern university filled the questionnaire after validation. One difference between the CTI and other trust instruments is that CTI focuses on the condition of trust in a specific target person. CTI consist of 11 components, each component contains four items of which one item represent " mistrust ". 5 Table 1 Components and Items in CTI

COMPONENTS	ITEMS
1. Availability	1, 2, 3(-), 4 2 .
2. Competence	5, 6(-), 7, 8 3.
3. Consistency	9, 10, 11, 12(-) 4.
4. Discreteness	13, 14(-), 15, 16 5 .
5. Fairness	17, 18(-), 19, 20 6 .
6. Integrity	21, 22, 23, 24(-) 7.
7. Loyalty	25, 26(-), 27, 28 8 .
8. Openness	29, 30, 31, 32(-) 9.
9. Overall Trust	33(-), 34, 35, 36 10.
10. Promise Fulfillment	37, 38(-), 39, 40 11.
11. Receptivity	41, 42, 43(-), 44

Relation of trust with others constructs: a. Relation Trust with Leader Member eXchange (LMX) Trust is an essential component of the dyadic Leader Member Exchange/ LMX (Butler, 1991). Higher -quality exchanges are friendly working relationship typified by mutual trust and support (Liden & Graen, 1980) in Deluga, 1994. Trust has generally been ascribed to " in -group " relation shi p in LMX (Brower ; Sch oorman and Tan, 200 0). A hi gher LMX



relationship is characterized by mutual trust, loyalty and behavior that extend outside the employment contract. b. Relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Organ (1988) defines OCB as work related behaviors that are discretionary, not related to formal organizational reward system, and promote the effective functioning of the organization. Deluga in 1994 conducted research in a military environment and found that subordinate OCB was positively related to 11 aspects of trust proposed by 6 Buttler (1991). Trust is related to OCB (Marlowe & Nyhan, 1992; Podsakof et al, 1990). It seems reasonable to suggest that when there is trust between supervisor and subordinate, the subordinate will be more willing to engage in extra-role behavior c. Relationship with Performance Appraisal McAllister (1995) found a positive relation between the behavioral consequences of trust and the supervisor's assessment of performance.

#### q.4 q.5 Smith and Barclay

(1997) found also a positive relation between trusting behavior and perceived trustworthiness with task performance using different rationales. (In Costa, <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/researchregister>). The relation between trust and high performance has been suggested by many authors (eg. Bromiley and Cummings, 1995; Butler, 1992) (In Costa (<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/researchregister>)). d. Relationship with "Liking" French and Raven (in Wayne and Liden, 1995) described being liked as "referent power" that provides the liked individual with influence. Furthermore, Tedeschi and Melburg (in Wayne and Liden, 1995) stated that "on a long term basis there are many potential gains for the liked person" such as better communication, trust, and



ability to influence. According to Cardy & Dobbins; De-Nisi & William; Strull & Wyer liking may influence supervisors' observation and storage of information over time as well as their recall at the time they actually rate a subordinate's performance (in Wayne and Liden, 1995). Individual similarities, such as attitudes, personality and demographic characteristics are related to interpersonal attraction, liking and disliking (Byrne, 1971). Wayne and Ferris, (1990) found strong support for relationship similarity and liking. Tsui and O'Reilly (1989) found demographic similarity to be significantly related to supervisor's rating of the degree to which they liked a subordinate. Studies by Dockery and Steiner; Liden et al; and Wayne, Shore and Liden support for a positive relationship between liking and LMX (Liden, Sparrowe, and Wayne, 1997). 7 e. Relation trust with job satisfaction In her research Costa found high trust within teams indicates lack of stress between members, high satisfaction with the team, commitment to the team, and high perception of task performance (Costa, 2nd article). In their research, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer (1996) found trust in leader explaining 31% of the variance in employees' general satisfaction which suggest that trust might mediate the relationship between TLBs and satisfaction (Butler & Cantrell, ....). Butler & Cantrell also found trust has relationship with satisfaction and with work. Hypothesis: 1. All of the 11 CTI components in leader and member version can be recovered in answers to CTI by Indonesians. 2. CTI components in leader data will be the same as CTI components in member data. 3. CTI in leader and member are a result of a mutually reinforcing process. 4.



CTI in leader and member have positive correlation with other constructs (such as Leader Member eXchange (LMX), Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Liking, Performance Appraisal (PA), and Job Satisfaction). 5. Exploration of the correlations of CTI (in leader and member) with demographic variables (such as age, sex, time post entry, education and organizational types) Methods and Data Collections In this study, data were collected from the larger LMX-Java project. Data collection was divided into two parts: a . Pilot Study In pilot study, back translation procedure was done from English to Indonesian and then back to English. All of the sessions were done by different persons who graduated from master degree faculty of letters and in the end a psychologist checked the final translations for the accuracy of the items from psychological point of view. After the back translations finish, experimental study was done for bilingual subjects. Each subject filled questionnaire twice by random, in English version and Indonesian version, with a 8 wash-out interval of two weeks. **q.6 Data were collected from 28 dyads (22 supervisors and 28 subordinates).** The general result in pilot study shows, all subject responses to the two versions were sufficiently consistent and equivalent. It means that subject responses in Indonesian version are similar to those in English version. b. Longitudinal Study Longitudinal study focused on socialization entry of new comers. This study was conducted in two time table data collections. First, in time 1 (for approximately 2-3 months after entry), 255 new comers (members) and their leaders were taken as subjects. Second, the same subjects filled in the questionnaires for the second time (approximately 6- 7 months), 234 responses were returned. Those



subjects came from four types of organization (education, manufacturing, distribution and finance), 76 organizations from central java regions were involved. Measures Some instruments were used to conduct this study. There were: Condition of Trust Inventory (CTI) by Butler, 1991 CTI consists of 11 components. q.1 q.2 Each componet contains four items of which one item represents " 5 6 mistrust q.1 q.2 ", the component are: availability, competence, consistency, discreetness, fairness, integrity, loyalty, openness, overall trust, promise fulfillment, and recepti vity. Eve ry compone nt has 4 items of which one item represent " mistrust ". q.10 Ea ch item was scaled from " 4 strongly disagree," 1, to "strongly agree, q.10 " 7. The instruction was: There are some statemen ts that describe how you might feel about your subordinate /supervisor. All your answers should refer to the same person (your subordinate /supervisor) . In your mind, fill the buttons each sta tement with your subordinat e&#39;s/supe rvisor &#39;s nam e. Item e x ample:" .is usually around when I need him/h er ". Leader Member Exchange multi dimensional measure (LMX-MDM) proposed by Liden and Maslyn (1998), consists of 4 componets (af fect, loyalty, contribution and professional respect), eve ry component has 3 items. The total ite ms were 1 2 ite ms. Each item was scaled from " strongly disagree ," 1, to "strongly agr ee, " 7. Factor 9 analysis output shows four components the same as the original . Some examples of the items are: This supervisor/subordinate is a lot of fun to work with (affect); This supervisor/subordinate would defend me to others in the organization if I made a serious mistake (loyalty); I can depend on this supervisor/subordinate to help when we are over loaded with work



(contribution); I am impressed with this supervisor's subordinate's knowledge of his/her job. Factor analysis output in subordinate data shows 4 factor solutions the same as the original. The reliabilities of the components are .82 (affect); .82 (loyalty); .74 (contribution) and .93 (professional respect). For supervisor data, factor analysis output shows neither the three nor the four dimension solution conform to the expected structure as original. So, one way to make a scale out of the twelve LMX-L items is to treat them as expression of the single underlying entity. The reliabilities of this single component is .92

Organization Citizenship Behavior (OCB), proposed by William and Anderson in 1991. OCB consist of two components: a). Organization Citizenship Behavior directed toward organization (OCB-0). These measures: sportsmanship, civic virtue and conscientiousness, which consists of 6 items. b). Organization Citizenship Behavior directed toward individual (OCB-I). These measures: altruism and courtesy, which consists of 6 items.

Each item was scaled from "1 2 3 strongly disagree," 1, to "strongly agree, " 5. Example of the items: " This employee sometimes takes underserved or extended work break" (OCB-0) and "This employee generally helps others who have been absent " (OCB-I). Factor analysis output shows 2 factors solution as the original. Item number 5 in has positive low loading in component 2. It should be negative high loading in component 2 which should be negative. Reliability analysis with excluded item number 5 shows .57 (OCB-0 Subordinate); .82 (OCB-I Subordinate); .72 (OCB-0 Supervisor) and .85 (OCB-I Supervisor). " Liking " proposed by Wayne and Ferris in 1990. It contains four items. Item number



1 was scale from " I don't like at all," 1, to "I like it very much, " 5. The question is How much do you like this subordinate/supervisor?. For item number 2 to 4 was scaled from " Strongly disagree, " 1, to "Strongly agree, " 5. Example of the item: " Supervising this subordinate is a pleasure ". Factor analysis output shows 1 factor solution. The reliability is .89 in Subordinate and .91 in Supervisor. 10 Performance appraisal by William Anderson (1991) consists of six items in role performance was used to measure performance. [q.7](#) [q.8](#) [q.9](#)

Each item was scaled from " [1](#) [2](#) [3](#) strongly disagree," 1, to "strongly agree,

[q.7](#) [q.8](#) [q.9](#) " 5. Example of the item : " This subordinate fulfills all the responsibilities specified in his/her job description ". Factor analysis output shows 2 factor solutions. Component 1 consists of 4 positive items (accountable) and component 2 consists of 2 negative items (unaccountable) . Reliability in Subordinate data: .87 (accountable) and .74 (unaccountable) . For Supervisor, .93 (accountable) and .75 (unaccountable) . Job Satisfaction . There are two measurements in job satisfaction used in this investigation in subordinate : a. Overall job satisfaction measured by Scarpello & Chambell , 1983 . In overall job satisfaction measure, employees will be asked about his/her satisfaction feeling in work experience in a single question: " Overall, how satisfied are you with your job? ". Item was scaled from " Not all satisfying," 1, to "Very satisfying, " 5. b . Five single item facet measures. [q.3](#) Measuring the same facets as the JDI (Job Description Index), Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969). The scales assess five facets: the work it self, the pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision and co-workers. Each facet has one item. Item example: " How does your supe





revisor that supervised you compare to what you think he/she should be? " Factor analysis output shows 1 factor solution . Reliability is .79 While the measurement job satisfaction in supervisor, they asked how much they satisfied in working with their subordinate and predicted their subordinate satisfaction . There were two questions: " How satisfied your work with your subordinate ?" and "According to you, how satisfied your subordinate with their new job ? " Factor analysis output shows 1 factor solution . Reliability is .81 Analyses We used several analyses such as factor analysis, reliability, correlations and manova for the testing the hypotheses. 11 Results In CTI subordinate (member), principal component analysis was done on the 255 (subjects) by 44 (items) data matrix . Ten components with eigen-values larger than 1.0 were found, explaining 69% of the variation . Some of intended factors are recovered as expected (competence, openness, availability & loyalty) but some of them are also partly different from the theoretically expected structure. There were three distrust factors. Item 32, which has distrust item, responses as positive meaning. This result shows that in member is not 11 components, but less and there were three distrust factors (see table 2). Table 2 USA-Components of CTI and their (non-)replication in Indonesia Members (Subordinates) NO (USA-) Components Indonesian TI-results 1 . Availability #R 2. Competence #R 7 . Loyalty #R 8 . Openness #R 3. Consistency Split-up over 4 factors 4 . Discreteness FI 5 . Fairness FI 6. Integrity FI 9. Overall Trust FI 10. Promise Fulfillment F2 11. Receptivity F2 3 distrust-factors (NEW!!) New-comer's leaders also completed the CTI questionnaire about their trust for each newcomer. There



were 180 leaders, some of whom judging several newcomers separately. This was specially the case in educational organizations . Principal component analysis was done on the 253 by 44 ( CTI items) data matrix . N ine components with eigen-values larger than 1.0 were fo und , explaining 68% of th e variance. Some of 12 intended factors are recovered as expected ( openness & availability) but some of them are also partly different from the theoretically expected structure. This pattern of result on " positive trust" is not the same as the one found in member data. There were three distrust factors. Item 32, which has distrust item, responses as positive meaning. This result shows that in member there were not 11 components, but less and there were three distrust factors (see table 3). So, hypothesis 1 is denied. Indonesian CTI components in leader data were very partly the same as CTI components in member data. Distrust factor was found in both groups, so hypothesis 2 is only very partly accepted. Table 3 USA-Components of CTI and their (non-)replication in Indonesia Leaders (Supervisors) NO (USA-) Components Indonesian TI-results 1. Availability #R 8. Openness #R 2. Competence FI 3. Consistency (FI, 50%) 4 . Discreteness FI 5. Fairness FI 6 . Integrity FI 9. Overall Trust F2 10. Promise Fulfillment F2 11. Receptivity F2 7. Loyalty scattered 3 distrust-factors (NEW! I) The result on the structure of CTI measure for leader and member in Central Java respondents do not have a clear conclusion yet. Thretherefore we focus now on the supposed mutuality and reciprocal as predicted by Zand&#39;s dynamic model in 1972 (Butler, 1991) of trust in dyad. Mutuallity means that leader and member have the same 13 understanding of trust. This means that in the factor



analysis they should have loadings on the same factor. Factor analysis was done on the &#39;vertically&#39;-combined datasets of leaders and members.

Mutuality presupposes (at least) that leaders and members have the same trust items loading on common factors. Inspection of scree-plot shows that only a 2- or 4- factor solution is feasible. The inspection of the 2-Factors: The output shows that the first factor is formed only by CTI answered by leaders and that factor 2 is formed only by items answered by members. These findings strongly suggest that leader&#39;s view on the trust-items is independent of

newcomers&#39; view on the same trust-items. Factor-1 for all leader-items and factor-2 for all member-items (&#39;Trust vs distrust&#39;). CTI ITEMS

Component 1 2 TRUSM101 -.039 .559 TRUSM102 -.059 .596 TRUSM103 (-) .064  
-.251 TRUSM104 -.059 .685 TRUSM105 -.053 .671 TRUSM106 (-) -.025 -.511  
TRUSM107 .003 .655 TRUSM108 .038 .655 TRUSM109 .129 .617 TRUSM110  
.044 .257 TRUSM111 .187 .643 TRUSM112 (-) .025 -.056 TRUSM113 .133 .570  
TRUSM114 (-) .026 -.246 TRUSM115 .179 .653 TRUSM116 .138 .610 TRUSM117  
.112 .769 TRUSM118 (-) -.088 -.355 TRUSM119 .063 .821 TRUSM120 .057 .774  
TRUSM121 .116 .797 TRUSM122 .148 .775 TRUSM123 .133 .793 TRUSM124 (-)  
-.036 -.479 TRUSM125 .105 .568 TRUSM126 (-) .020 -.363 14 TRUSM127 .104  
.336 TRUSM128 .082 .442 TRUSM129 .056 .498 TRUSM130 .067 .414  
TRUSM131 .073 .631 TRUSM132 (-) .100 .332 TRUSM133 (-) .031 -.445  
TRUSM134 .078 .774 T TRUSM135 .098 .784 TRUSM136 .086 .777 TRUSM137  
.037 .744 TRUSM138 (-) .111 -.075 TRUSM139 .039 .793 TRUSM140 -.033 ...  
609 TRUSM141 .057 .704 TRUSM142 .036 .700 TRUSM143 (-) .057 -.248



TRUSM144 .056 .606 TRUSL 101 .692 .021 TRUSL102 .623 .038 TRUSL 103 (-)  
-.163 -.103 TRUSL 104 .609 -.002 TRUSL 105 .765 .066 TRUSL 106 (-) -.254  
-.129 TRUSL107 .747 .084 TRUSL108 .760 .063 TRUSL 109 .743 .080 TRUSL  
110 .339 -.084 TRUSL 111 .735 .036 TRUSL 112 (-) -.077 -.108 TRUSL 113 .683  
.036 TRUSL 114 (-) -.133 -.170 TRUSL 115 .722 -.041 TRUSL 116 .685 -.022  
TRUSL117 (-) .799 -.014 TRUSL 118 -.044 -.124 TRUSL 119 .703 -.007  
TRUSL120 .765 .026 TRUSL 121 .797 .028 TRUSL 122 .778 .095 TRUSL123 .787  
.070 TRUSL 124 (-) -.226 -.155 TRUSL125 .591 .083 TRUSL 126 (-) -.069 -.090  
TRUSL127 .292 .029 TRUSL128 .426 .059 TRUSL 129 .673 .114 15 TRUSL130  
.590 .110 TRUSL 131 .686 .122 TRUSL 132 (-) .353 -.030 TRUSL133 (-) -.121  
-.106 TRUSL134 .646 .079 TRUSL135 .744 .132 TRUSL136 .758 .121 TRUSL 137  
.725 .089 TRUSL 138 (-) .043 -.130 TRUSL 139 .619 .054 TRUSL 140 .606 .099  
TRUSL 141 .673 -.021 TRUSL142 .787 .019 TRUSL 143 (-) -.053 ..-.098  
TRUSL144 .673 .085 Also inspection of the 4-factor solution leader and member  
items form independent pairs of trust and distrust factors. CTI ITEMS  
Component 1 2 3 4 TRUSM101 -.039 .567 .051 -.053 TRUSM102 -.062 .609 .030  
-.021 TRUSM103 (-) .051 -.232 -.101 .180 TRUSM104 -.074 .669 -.149 -.086  
TRUSM105 -.051 .643 -.010 -.218 TRUSM106 (-) -.041 -.410 .046 .549  
TRUSM107 .009 .620 .007 - .259 TRUSM108 .043 .621 -.008 -.252 TRUSM109  
.135 .584 .000 -.250 TRUSM110 .043 .290 .075 .097 TRUSM111 .189 .628 .010  
-.166 TRUSM112 (-) .013 -.019 -.042 .215 TRUSM113 .125 .539 -.136 -.162  
TRUSM114 (-) .008 -.139 .062 .540 TRUSM115 .175 .670 .023 -.015 TRUSM116  
.133 .635 .030 .028 TRUSM117 .112 .740 -.033 -.233 TRUSM118 (-) -.111 -.270



-.053.503 TRUSM119.062.802-.012-.196 TRUSM120.062.747.019-.246  
TRUSM121.113.786-.029-.147 TRUSM122.148.767.002-.149 TRUSM123  
.131.771-.044-.192 TRUSM124 (-).-.062-.399-.097.518 16 TRUSM125.099  
.555-.074-.101 TRUSM126 (-).003-.272.025.494 TRUSM127.084.356-.147  
.132 TRUSM128.062.469-.125.143 TRUSM129.024.592-.081.455  
TRUSM130.035.519-.067.516 TRUSM131.058.705.055.267 TRUSM132 (-)  
.077.385-.102.274 TRUSM133 (-).021-.358.088.453 TRUSM134.074.753  
-.056-.175 TRUSM135.099.752-.029-.250 TRUSM136.083.751-.068-.196  
TRUSM137.020.733-.158-.067 TRUSM138 (-).111... 002.175.308  
TRUSM139.027.771-.140-.135 TRUSM140-.057.650-.112.195 TRUSM141  
.049.716-.032-.015 TRUSM142.024.700-.093-.040 TRUSM143 (-).039-.145  
.048.526 TRUSM144.033.636-.139.147 TRUSL 101.686.007-.133-.033  
TRUSL102.632.014-.005-.150 TRUSL 103 (-).-109-.079.610-.173  
TRUSL104.606-.008-.080-.017 TRUSL105.770.055-.019-.088 TRUSL 106  
(-).-205-.083.612-.057 TRUSL 107.741.091-.089.032 TRUSL108.756.074  
-.058.039 TRUSL109.737.069-.125-.037 TRUSL 110.362-.079.223-.098  
TRUSL 111.730.026-.116-.027 TRUSL 112 (-).-033-.088.500-.140 TRUSL  
113.672.045-.126.075 TRUSL 114 (-).-082-.096.700.036 TRUSL 115.719  
-.049-.093-.023 TRUSL 116.686-7.734E-06.026.068 TRUSL 117.800-.006  
-.020.014 TRUSL 118 (-).-001-.067.567.010 TRUSL 119.697.001-.087.053  
TRUSL120.754.042-.124.104 TRUSL121.794.019-.100-.033 TRUSL 122  
.775.080-.112-.066 TRUSL123.787.084-.016.036 TRUSL 124 (-).-169-.093  
.731-.038 TRUSL 125.581.073-.160-.002 TRUSL126 (-).-027-.015.612.078



TRUSL127 .290 .025 -.046 -.013 17 TRUSL128 .423 .092 .025 .128 TRUSL129  
.681 .153 .134 .086 TRUSL130 .603 .155 .207 .081 TRUSL131 .698 .148 .141  
.014 TRUSL132 (-) .371 -.021 .180 -.064 TRUSL133 (-) -.079 -.014 .648 .146  
TRUSL134 .644 .067 -.091 -.056 TRUSL135 .732 .145 -.132 .082 TRUSL136  
.752 .122 -.099 .010 TRUSL137 .725 .114 .025 .069 TRUSL138 (-) .077 -.051  
.528 .139 TRUSL139 .634 .057 .130 -.084 TRUSL140 .609 .087 -.029 -.085  
TRUSL141 .672 .. -.001 -.002 .076 TRUSL142 .787 .037 -.007 .057 TRUSL143  
(-) -.004 -.022 .684 .040 TRUSL144 .675 .117 .056 .089 There is neither Leader  
and Member-mutuality in an overall-trust measure, nor in more detailed trust-  
and distrust-measure .. Leader's trust of a subordinate is different construct  
from the subordinate's trust in leader . So, hypothesis 3 is denied.  
Intermediate summary regarding hypothesis 1 to 3: 1). Indonesian workers and  
supervisors do not use the very detailed concept of trust (11 components) that  
USA (MBA)-students use. 2) Indonesian worker & supervisors only partly use th  
e same concept of trust, on a detailed level of analysis. 3a) There is no mutuality  
within (leader memberj-dyads; 3b) Workers and supervisors have the same  
concept of trust, on a general level of analysis. CTI was calculated by two scores  
for two groups employees separately for this research : (a) The total score of  
the 33 positive CTI items; scale 1-7 (general trust) and (b) total score of 10  
negative CTI items; scale 1-7 (general distrust), with excluded item 32 because  
the two groups response positively . General trust alpha correlation in Member  
and Leader = .96 . General distrust alpha correlation in Member .74 and Lead  
er .83. Average trust levels are shown in the following graph. 18 180 175 170



165 160 TRUST L-->M 155 • TRUST M-->L 150 145 140 2mo 3mo 4mo 5mo 6mo 7mo 8mo p.e. p.e p.e p.e p.e p.e p.e p.e Graph 1 Average trust level in Central Java Subjects Note : Horizontal line refers to times: 2 months post entry, three months post entry , etc . The vertical line refers to total number of responses . If the score is higher than 149, it indicates at least moderate trust. The discrepancy between leader and member responses is small and shows in steady decline . The analysis of test retest stability of measures over a 4 months interval generally shows moderate positive correlation. It means subject's response to the item in time 1 is moderately the same as in time 2. Interesting finding was found in CTI leader data. The result show there was no correlation. It means leader's responses to the CTI time 1 is different from time 2. 19

Table 4 Test-retest stabilities of measures over a 4-month interval

CONSTRUCTS	COMPONENTS	CORRELATION	TI&T2	MEMBER	LEADER
Condition of Trust Inv. (CTI)	General Trust	.58**	.09	General Distrust	.39** .06 2
. L-M-eXchange Affect	.50** .50**	Loyalty	.43**	Contribution	.36** Professional
Respect	.51 ** 3	Org. Citizenship Behavior	OCB-0 .25** .30**	OCB-I	.35** .36**
4 Performance Appraisal PA ( + )	&#39;accountable&#39;	.31 ** .31 **	PA (-)&#39;un-accountable&#39;	.36** .38**	4. Liking .48** .35**
6 Job-Satisfaction	.48** .46** **)	correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)	To find out	CTI-scores in leader and member whether they have the expected positive	correlations with other constructs (such as Leader Member eXchange (LMX),
Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Liking, Performance Appraisal (PA), and Job Satisfaction), correlation analysis were done. To explore of the					



correlations of CTI (in leader and member) with demographic variables (such as age, sex, time post entry, education and organizational types), manova analysis was done. The result shows: With general trust almost all constructs shows positive correlations, except the unaccountable components in performance appraisal (member). Almost all constructs in member general distrust show positive correlation, but there were two components in LMX which show no correlations (loyalty & contribution). In leader, general distrust has no correlation with LMX, OCB-I, Likening and Job Satisfaction, but has correlation with OCB-O and Performance Appraisal (accountable & unaccountable). Almost all exploratory 20 demography variables show no correlations with trust. Age & member general trust have positive correlation. Sex in leader shows negative correlation with trust (L).

**General Discussion** The objective of our research was to investigate if condition of trust inventory (CTI) could be used for research in Indonesia. The result of the study shows that the CTI could be used for research in Indonesia but with several adaptations. To guarantee that the original items (English Version) are the same those in Indonesian version, the back translation procedure and experiment study were done with bilingual subjects. The general result shows that all subject responses in Indonesian .. version are similar to those in English version. Revision should be made in the number of the CTI components because factor analyses output in supervisor and subordinate data shows some of intended factor which are recovered as expected but some of them are also partly different from the theoretically expected structure. Factor analysis output to CTI refers that CTI can be best scored on two components:





general trust, which contains of all 33 CTI positive items and general distrust, which consists of 10 CTI negative items (with excluded item number 32, because subjects response as positive items). Zand (Brower et al, 2000) stated that the development of trust as a spiral reinforcement process and furthermore Butler (1991) argue that the development of trust is also cyclical, mutually reinforcing process. In this research, the result shows that there was no mutual relationship between supervisor's trust in subordinate and subordinate's trust in leader. They have different point of view about trust. So, in this case it could happen that supervisor could trust their subordinate but subordinate could not trust their supervisor and vice versa. However, trust literatures argue that the supervisor's trust of a subordinate is a different construct from subordinate's trust in supervisor. Thus, level of trust maybe different. According to Mayer et al (Brower et al, 2000) trust need not be mutual. It is possible to supervisor to trust a subordinate and at that time, the subordinate may not trust the supervisor. Level of trust is individual and does not carry this level across settings . Trust has relation with other constructs. According to Liden & Graen (in deluga, 1994) and Brower et al (2000), higher quality LMX is characterized by mutual trust, 21 support, loyalty and behavior that extend the employment contract. In this research, the result also shows that LMX has moderate positive correlation with general trust: for both leaders and members. For general distrust, two components in members (affect and professional respect) show positive correlation. However, two components in members (loyalty & contribution) show no correlation with LMX. Leaders have



no correlation with the four components . Trust has correlations with OCB . In general trust, both leaders and members have positive correlations. Result for general distrust, in OCB-0 component, both leaders and members have positive correlation. In OCB-1, members have positive correlation but, there is no correlation in 1 leaders. This finding is supported by result finding done by Deluga (1994). He found that subordinate OCB was positively related to CTI and this was also supported Marlove & Nyhan (1992); Podsakof et al (1990) which stated that trust is related to OCB. Performance has correlated with trust. Result for general trust: accountable component show positive correlation in leaders and members. In unaccountable component, leader shows positive correlation, but no correlation exist in members. Result for general distrust: members and leaders have positive correlation with accountable and unaccountable component. This finding was also asserted by Mc Allister (1995) and Smith & Barclay (1997), found a positive relation between performance and trust. Trust also has relation with satisfaction. This research found that for general trust: both leaders and members have positive correlations. Meanwhile, for general distrust, members have positive correlation but leaders have no correlation . Costa( ... ) also stated that high trust is correlated with high task performance. Furthermore, Butler & Cantrel ( .... ) also found trust has relationship with satisfaction with work. Wayne and Ferris, 1990 found strong support for relationship similarity and liking. Furthermore, studies by Dockery and Steines, 1990; Liden et al, 1993; and Wayne, Shore and Liden (in Liden et al, 1997) maintained a positive relationship between liking and LMX. As stated before, LMX has



relation to trust , so it can predicted that liking will have relation with trust. Result output in this research shows for gener al trust , both 22 leaders and member have positive correlations. For general distrust, members have positive correlation . While that in leaders, there is no correlation Exploration study for the correlation of CTI (in Leader and Member) with demographic variables such as age, sex, time post entry, education and organization types shows that result for general trust, there are almost no relations found except age in member and result for general distrust, only sex of leader responses have negative correlation . Conclusions The factor analysis output shows that trust construct from the West appears to be different from that of Central Java workers and supervisors. To solve this problem, the Indonesian CTI can best be scored on two dimensions : general trust and general distrust. General trust measure shows the expected positive correlations with measure of other constructs (such as LMX, OCB, Liking, Job Performance and Job Satisfaction). There is no mutuality trust between leader and member. With regard to mutuality (Leader Member), Leader-trust did not predict Member-trust; also, there was on averag e not much discrepancy between Leader-trust and Member-trust . Reference Brower, III; Schoorman, FD; Tan, III. R.4 R.10 R.11 2000. A model of relational leadership: the integration of trust and leader-member exchange.

#### R.4 Leadership

Quarterly, Vol. 11 (2), p.227-250 Butler, JK.1991. Toward Understanding and Measuring Conditions of Trust: Evolution of a Condition of Trust Inventory. Journal of Management. Vol. 17, No.3, p. 643-663 Costa, AC. The Role of Trust for the Functioning of Teams in Organizations. R.13 R.14 Delft University of









Technology, Delft, The Netherlands Costa, AC. Work Team Trust and Effectiveness. Section of Work and Organizational Psychology, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands (<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/researchregister>) 23 Deluga, RJ. R.1 R.2 R.3 1994. Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior. R.1 R.2 R.3 R.9 R.15 R.16 R.17 R.18 R.19 R.20 R.21 R.22 R.23 R.24 R.25 Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology. Vol. 67, p. 315-326. Dunn, JR; Schweitzwe, ME.2005. R.5 R.6 R.7 R.8 Feeling and Believing: The Influence of Emotion on Trust. R.5 R.6 R.7 R.8 R.9 R.12 R.26 R.27 R.28 R.29 R.30 R.31 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. R.12 Vol. 88(5), May 2005, p. 736- 748 Liden, RC; Sparrowe, RT; Wayne, SJ.1997. Leader-Member Exchange Theory: The Past and Potential for The Future . Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management. Vol. 15, p. 47-119 Omodei, MM; McLennan, J.2000. Conceptualizing and Measuring Global Interpersonnal Mistrust-Trust. The Journal of Social Psychology . 140 (3), p. 279-294 Wayne, SJ; Liden, RC.1995. Effects of Impression Management on Performance Ratings: A Longitudinal Study. R.12 Academy of Management Journal. Vol. 38, No. 1, p. 232- 260 24













# Sources

## PLAGIARISM 0.23%

1	www.tfzr.uns.ac.rs	0.14%		2	www.diva-portal.o...	0.14%	
3	www.scielo.org.za	0.14%		4	www.researchgate..	0.07%	
5	media.iese.edu	0.01%		6	www.frontiersin.org	0.01%	

























## IN QUOTES 1.54%

1	www.frontiersin.org	0.62%		2	media.iese.edu	0.39%	
3	wikispaces.psu.edu	0.35%		4	pdfs.semanticscho..	0.27%	
5	www.en.cams.bwl...	0.27%		6	www.researchgate..	0.12%	
7	www.tfzr.uns.ac.rs	0.1%		8	www.diva-portal.o...	0.1%	
9	www.scielo.org.za	0.1%		10	www.researchgate..	0.05%	

## IN REFERENCES 0.81%

1	people.uleth.ca	0.25%		2	trace.tennessee.ed..	0.25%	
3	www.researchgate..	0.25%		4	opus.lib.uts.edu.au	0.2%	
5	julkaisut.haaga-he...	0.17%		6	blogit.metropolia.fi	0.17%	



<b>7</b>	kokoronotanken.jp	0.17%		<b>8</b>	lamenteesmaravill..	0.17%	
<b>9</b>	en.wikipedia.org	0.16%		<b>10</b>	www.researchgate..	0.15%	
<b>11</b>	www.researchgate..	0.15%		<b>12</b>	freedomrunners.or..	0.14%	
<b>13</b>	opencardiovascula..	0.11%		<b>14</b>	opencardiovascula..	0.11%	
<b>15</b>	oxfordre.com	0.09%		<b>16</b>	oxfordre.com	0.09%	
<b>17</b>	oxfordre.com	0.09%		<b>18</b>	www.researchgate..	0.09%	
<b>19</b>	oxfordre.com	0.09%		<b>20</b>	oxfordre.com	0.09%	
<b>21</b>	libres.uncg.edu	0.09%		<b>22</b>	oxfordre.com	0.09%	
<b>23</b>	sajip.co.za	0.09%		<b>24</b>	oxfordre.com	0.09%	
<b>25</b>	en.wikipedia.org	0.09%		<b>26</b>	amenteemaravilho..	0.07%	
<b>27</b>	en.wikipedia.org	0.07%		<b>28</b>	journals.plos.org	0.07%	
<b>29</b>	nospensees.fr	0.07%		<b>30</b>	pieknoumyslu.com	0.07%	
<b>31</b>	www.ncbi.nlm.nih....	0.07%	